



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,105	04/14/2004	Mark A. King	KING 0101 PUS	6159
22045	7590	08/11/2004	EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			GRILES, BETHANY L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3643		

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/824,105	KING, MARK A.
	Examiner Bethany L. Griles	Art Unit 3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the second fishing pole holder" in lines 24 and 27.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann US3139252 in view of Wilde GB2178931A.

6. Regarding claim 1, Mann discloses a fishing pole holder with a C-clamp 7 having a main portion extending over a generally vertical wall of the boat 42, a base plate 14, a clamping force reaction cushion 16, a clamping shaft 15 threadably connected to the first arm 12, which is also the threaded support shaft 12, and a first fishing pole holder 8, 34, means for adjusting the angular position of the holder element about a first axis that intersects the support shaft axis 30, and means for adjusting the angular position of the first fishing pole hole element about the axis of the support shaft 26.

7. Mann does not disclose a second fishing pole holder element.

8. Wilde discloses multiple fishing pole holder elements 17a-17d.

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Wilde of multiple rod cradles to the invention of Mann in order to make the device more efficient and to take up less space on the gunwale of the boat by avoiding having multiple clamps attached. This addition of a second rod holder would be a mere duplication of parts.

10. Regarding claim 2, Mann discloses the pole holder element is generally cylindrical 33.

11. Mann does not disclose a second fishing pole holder element.

12. Wilde discloses multiple fishing pole holder elements 17a-17d.

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Wilde of multiple rod cradles to the invention of Mann in order to make the device more efficient and to take up less space

on the gunwale of the boat by avoiding having multiple clamps attached. This addition of a second rod holder would be a mere duplication of parts.

14. Regarding claims 3 and 4, Mann discloses a strap clamp and a clamping bolt extending through the clamp (col 2, lines 56-63).
15. Mann does not disclose a second fishing pole holder element.
16. Wilde discloses multiple fishing pole holder elements 17a-17d.
17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Wilde of multiple rod cradles to the invention of Mann in order to make the device more efficient and to take up less space on the gunwale of the boat by avoiding having multiple clamps attached. This addition of a second rod holder would be a mere duplication of parts.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wallace et al. US4852290 ; Nebergall et al. US2693660; Tilley US6766757; Suter US5975479; Leisner US4198775; Dumler US4017998; Harris US2606731; Grevich US2513475.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bethany L. Griles whose telephone number is 703.305.1839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 703.308.2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Bethany L. Griles
Examiner
Art Unit 3643


Peter M. Poon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3600


8/6/04